



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/403,505	01/02/2000	MICHAEL HERMAN KOCH	54270/	7382

7590 11/26/2001

FOLEY & LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOUR
3000 K STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 200075109

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TALBOT, BRIAN K

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2001 *do*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/403,505	KOCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian K Talbot	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-15, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-11, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri ority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>19</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/7/01 has been entered.

2. The amendment filed 11/7/01 has been considered and entered. Claims 1 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 2-15 and 17-18 remain in the application with claims 12-15 being directed toward a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6 and 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 6, the term "non directional deposition technique" lacks antecedent basis.

With respect to claim 18, the term “heating surface” is unclear. Is this substrate’s surface or the source material surface? Clarification is requested.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2-7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for coating a optical fiber, does not reasonably provide enablement for “all non-planar substrates”. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-11 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winn et al. (5,168,540) in combination with Donckel et al. (3,860,444).

Winn et al. (5,168,540) teaches coating a fiber by CVD with a scintillating material. The scintillating material can be a number of metal compounds including zinc oxide (abstract).

Looking at Figure 2, a source gas of the scintillating material (208) is supplied into a deposition chamber (202) where a substrate (212) is located on a holder (210). The substrate can

be an optical fiber (col. 2, lines 65-69). The holder (210) can be heated so as to aid in the deposition of the coating material (col. 7, lines 5-30).

Winn et al. (5,168,540) fails to teach heating the source material to provide the gaseous coating material.

Donckel et al. (3,860,444) teaches coating a fiber by CVD wherein the coating material is heated to form a vapor that is subsequently coated on the fiber.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Winn et al. (5,168,540) CVD process by incorporating a “heated source” material as opposed to a source material which is already in gaseous form because of the expectation of achieving similar results.

With respect to claim 9-11, the claims recite “clamping” the fiber substrate. While the Examiner acknowledges the fact that Winn et al. (5,168,540) teaches glueing the fiber substrate to the holder, it is the Examiner position that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar results regardless of the holding mechanism utilized. Furthermore, the use of “clamps” to hold a substrate such as a fiber for coating is convention in the coating art.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 1762

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-6078 for regular communications and (703) 305-6357 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.



Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT
November 16, 2001